

From: Eric Endersby [mailto:eendersby@mac.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2006 10:58 PM
To: MLPACComments@resources.ca.gov
Subject: MLPACComments: Package S

John Kirlin and Mike DeLapa:

With all due respect, I must say that I feel completely and totally ambushed by Package S, and after having looked at all the package maps side-by-side, as a former RSG primary member my blood is past the boiling point. My takeaway from the last BRTF meeting was that the BRTF wasn't charged with, nor going to create, a "whole-cloth" (your words John) MPA package proposal. However, a close inspection of Package S reveals that there are quite a number of MPAs in it that aren't in any of the other packages 1, 2, 3, or AC, making it pretty darn close to whole-cloth. For example:

1. The Package S Ano Nuevo SMR is some kind of ----- hybrid between the Package 2-3 and AC proposals.
2. The Package S Natural Bridges SMR is an unnecessary expansion of the Package 2 and 3 proposals.
3. The Package S proposals in the Ricketts/Hopkins zone is another ----- hybrid, and a broken-up one at that that the BRTF itself said was no good.
4. The Package S Point Sur SMR/SMCA combo is a ----- hybrid between Packages 2 and 3.
5. The Package S Julia P-B SMR/SMCA combo is for all intents and purposes completely new.
6. The Package S Big Creek SMR is cookie-cut from a Package 3 proposal.
7. The Package S Cambria SMP/SMR combo is close to the Package 3 proposal, but still considerably different.
8. The Package S Point Buchon SMR/SMCA combo is a ----- hybrid between the Package 1, 2, and 3 proposals.
9. The Package S Purisima SMR is almost, but not quite, the same as the Package 2 proposal.
10. The Package S Vandenberg SMR is a ----- hybrid of the Package 2 and 3 proposals.

And if that weren't enough, where are the site-specific proponent rationales, and statements of goals and objectives met that all other package proponents were required to make to "complete" their packages, especially for the new proposals above? The answer is, there aren't any, which is cause enough for Package S to be disqualified as an incomplete proposal. And to top it off, to my understanding packages 1, 2, 3, and AC have passed SAT muster today, which means that DFG has four "SAT-valid" packages to choose from. Package S is not required, therefore, throwing it into the mix is a cold slap in the face to ALL RSG members!

PACKAGE S IS SO COMPLETELY OUT OF BOUNDS THAT IN MY OPINION IT CALLS INTO QUESTION THE OBJECTIVITY AND INTEGRITY OF THE BRTF THAT DIRECTED IT AND THE I-TEAM STAFF THAT PUT IT TOGETHER. IF PACKAGE S IS ALLOWED TO GO FORWARD, ESPECIALLY AS THE BRTF "PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE," I WILL BE CONVINCED THAT I DID JUST WASTE EIGHT MONTHS OF MY LIFE, AND WILL NOT-SO RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT MY NAME BE STRICKEN FROM ALL FINAL DOCUMENTS AS HAVING HAD ANY PART IN THIS PROCESS BECAUSE I WON'T WANT TO BE ASSOCIATED WITH IT. IN SHORT, PACKAGE S IS MY WALKING PAPERS.

I am absolutely astonished that the BRTF, and the I-Team staff for that matter, could go forward with re-tooling all of the hard and earnest work that the RSG members accomplished. I could understand, but just barely in light of the SAT meeting today, if the I-Team had picked and chosen from the existing packages for their preferred alternative recommendation to the BRTF. But to have gone ahead and made a "Frankenpackage" with numerous completely different proposals, I'm afraid exposes this whole RLFF-funded part of the process as a fix. The I-Team and BRTF could have only created Package S

with their own agenda and with the direct involvement of SAT members, completely outside the "clear and transparent" public process that was the RSG and its many months of grueling hard work. This is flat wrong.

I can only hope that DFG staff and the Fish and Game Commission will keep the public trust that is embodied in the RSG and its work, because they are the only ones who can restore any sense of objectivity and impartiality to this process.

Signed,

Eric Endersby